

Remarks:

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of dependent claim 2, which claim has been cancelled. Claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and claim 21 has been amended to refer to the process of any one of claims 3 to 5.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,639,042. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the feature of claim 2, which claim was not rejected by the Examiner. Since claims 4, 5, 10, 13, 14 and 15 ultimately depend from claim 1 and since claim 18 is directed to a product of the process of claim 1 and claims 19, 20 and 21 are directed to products of process claims which ultimately depend from claim 1, it is believed that this rejection has been overcome by the amendment.

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 now specifies that the polyimide is in the form of a membrane, providing antecedent for this term in claim 17.

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 22-28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The feature of claim 2 has been added into claim 1 and the remaining claims ultimately depend from claim 1 or refer to a process claim ultimately dependent on claim 1. It is therefore believed that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/713,869
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2005

No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By: 

Richard J. Polley
Registration No. 28,107

One World Trade Center
121 S.W. Salmon Street, Suite 1600
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 226-7391
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446